

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINGE 17

(FRI) 1.15'99 15: ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 2

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CORDIS CORPORATION and  
EXPANDABLE GRAFTS  
PARTNERSHIP,

Plaintiffs,

v.  
ADVANCED CARDIOVASCULAR  
SYSTEMS, INC.; GUIDANT  
CORPORATION; ARTERIAL  
VASCULAR ENGINEERING, INC.;  
BOSTON SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION;  
and SCIMED LIFE SYSTEMS, INC.,

Defendants.



) Civil Action No. 97-550-SLR  
(Consolidated)

---

ARTERIAL VASCULAR ENGINEERING,  
INC.,

Plaintiff,

v. ) Civil Action No. 97-700-SLR

CORDIS CORPORATION, JOHNSON  
& JOHNSON, and EXPANDABLE  
GRAFTS PARTNERSHIP,

Defendants.

---

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15: /ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 3

Steven J. Balick, Esquire, and Steven J. Margolin, Esquire, of Ashby & Geddes, Wilmington, Delaware, attorneys for plaintiffs. Of Counsel: Gregory L. Diskant, Esquire, Eugene M. Gelernter, Esquire, John M. DiMatteo, Esquire, Michael J. Timmons, Esquire, and Willard C. Shih, Esquire, of Patterson, Belknap, Webb & Tyler LLP, New York, New York, and Barry A. Chasnow, Esquire, and Pamela G. Matthews, Esquire, of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, LLP.

Frederick L. Cottrell, III, Esquire, and Jeffrey L. Moyer, Esquire, of Richards, Layton & Finger, Wilmington, Delaware, attorneys for defendants Advanced Cardiovascular Systems, Inc. and Guidant Corporation. Of Counsel: Richard A. Bardin, Esquire, Craig B. Bailey, Esquire, John S. Nagy, Esquire, and Paul Y. Feng, Esquire, of Fulwider Patton Lee & Utecht, LLP, Los Angeles, California; and Aldo A. Badini, Esquire, Jack Kaufman, Esquire, and Henry Ricardo, Esquire, of Dewey Ballantine LLP, New York, New York.

Patricia Smink Rogowski, Esquire, and Francis DiGiovanni, Esquire, of Connolly, Bove, Lodge & Hutz, Wilmington, Delaware, attorneys for defendant Arterial Vascular Engineering, Inc. Of Counsel: William E. Wallace III, Esquire, Richard S. Meyer, Esquire, D. Michael Underhill, Esquire, and John H. Williamson, Esquire, of Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP, Washington, D.C., and Richard L. Klein, of Arterial Vascular Engineering, Inc., Santa Rosa, California.

Josy W. Ingersoll, Esquire, and Matthew G. Zaleski, Esquire, of Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor, LLP, Wilmington, Delaware, attorneys for defendants Boston Scientific Corporation and Scimed Life Systems, Inc. Of Counsel: Charles R. Brainard, Esquire, Arthur D. Gray, Esquire, Albert J. Breneisen, Esquire, and Paul A. Bondor, Esquire, of Kenyon & Kenyon, New York, New York.

-----

**MEMORANDUM OPINION**

Dated: January 15, 1999  
Wilmington, Delaware

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15: ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 4

  
ROBINSON, District Judge**I. INTRODUCTION**

Pending before the court are multiple motions filed in the above-captioned cases, all relating to a series of patents involving "expandable intraluminal grafts." That which follows is the court's construction of disputed claim language. Separate opinions addressing the substantive issues of infringement and validity shall follow.

**II. BACKGROUND**

The patents-in-suit are U.S. Patent Nos. 4,739,762 ("the '762 patent"),<sup>1</sup> 5,102,417 ("the '417 patent"), and 5,195,984 ("the '984 patent").<sup>2</sup> The '762 patent is a continuation-in-part ("CIP") of U.S. Patent No. 4,733,665 ("the '665 patent") and the '417 patent is a CIP of the '762 patent. The '417 and '984 patents have substantially similar disclosures.

---

<sup>1</sup>The '762 patent was submitted for re-examination in October 1997. The Patent and Trademark Office apparently confirmed the patentability of claims 23 and 34, and found claims 1-12, 14-22, 25-33, and 35-42, as amended, and new claims 44-59, to be patentable. (C.A. No. 97-550, D.I. 323, Ex. D)

<sup>2</sup>All the patents-in-suit are reproduced, e.g., in C.A. No. 97-550, D.I. 323, Exs. A, B, C, and E.

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15. /ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 5

The '762 patent, filed on November 3, 1986, discloses a single expandable intraluminal graft, and a method and apparatus for implanting it. As summarized in the '762 patent,

[t]he invention relates to an expandable intraluminal graft for use within a body passageway or duct and, more particularly, expandable intraluminal vascular grafts which are particularly useful for repairing blood vessels narrowed or occluded by disease; and a method and apparatus for implanting expandable intraluminal grafts.

('762 patent, col. 1, lns. 19-25). The specification of the '762 patent describes the expandable intraluminal graft as follows:

The present invention includes a thin-walled tubular member having first and second ends and a wall surface disposed between the first and second ends, the wall[']s surface having a substantially uniform thickness and a plurality of slots formed therein, the slots being disposed substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the tubular member; the tubular shaped member having a first diameter which permits intraluminal delivery of the thin-walled tubular member into a body passageway having a lumen; and the tubular member having a second, expanded diameter, upon the application from the interior of the tubular member of a radially, outwardly extending force, which second diameter is variable and dependent upon the amount of force applied to the tubular member, whereby the tubular shaped member may be expanded and deformed to expand the lumen of the body passageway.

\* \* \* \* \*

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15. ST. 15:53/N0. 4261609027 P 6

The method of the present invention comprises the steps of: utilizing a thin-walled, tubular member as the prosthesis, the tubular member having a plurality of slots formed therein, the slots being disposed substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of the tubular member . . . .

\* \* \* \* \*

The expandable intraluminal vascular graft, method for implanting a prosthesis within a body passageway, and apparatus for intraluminally reinforcing a body passageway of the present invention, when compared with previously proposed prior art intraluminal grafts, methods for implanting them, and balloon dilation techniques have the advantages of: preventing recurrence of stenoses; is believed to permit implantation of grafts in critical body passageways, such as in the left main coronary artery of the heart; prevents recoil of the body passageway; prevents erosion of the body passageway by the expanded graft; and permits expansion of the graft to a variable size dependent upon conditions within the body passageway.

(`762 patent, col. 3, lns. 34-51; col. 4, lns. 6-11, 62-68 and col. 5, lns. 1-7) (emphasis added).

When the '417 patent application was filed in 1988, an additional problem was addressed.

For repairing blood vessels narrowed or occluded by disease, or repairing other body passageways, the length of the body passageway which requires repair, as by the insertion of a tubular prosthetic graft, may present problems if the length of the

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15. /31.15:53/NO.4261609027 P 7

required graft cannot negotiate the curves or bends of the body passageway through which the graft is passed by the catheter. In other words, in many instances, it is necessary to support a length of tissue within a body passageway by a graft, wherein the length of the required graft exceeds the length of a graft which can be readily delivered via a catheter to the desired location within the vascular system. Some grafts do not have the requisite ability to bend so as to negotiate the curves and bends present within the vascular system, particularly prostheses or grafts which are relatively rigid and resist bending with respect to their longitudinal axes.

('417 patent, col. 3, lns. 5-21; '984 patent, col. 2, lns. 63-68 and col. 3, lns. 1-11) Consequently, the '417 patent, although mirroring the '762 patent, added

[a] further feature . . . that at least one connector member may be disposed in a non-parallel relationship with respect to the longitudinal axis of the tubular members. Another feature of the present invention is that . . . at least one connector member may be disposed coplanar with each tubular member and non-parallel to the longitudinal axis of the tubular members. An additional feature of the present invention is that at least one connector member may be a thin-walled, spiral member, coplanar with adjacent tubular members.

('417 patent, col. 4, lns. 8-18) (emphasis added).

The '984 patent, filed in 1991, substituted the following feature for that recited above, that there be a

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15. 7:15:53/N0.4261609027 P 8

single connector member [which] may be a thin-walled, elongate bar member, coplanar with adjacent tubular members. An additional feature of the present invention is that a first connector member may be disposed between the second end of a first tubular member and the first end of a second tubular member; a second connector member may be disposed between the second end of the second tubular member and the first end of a third tubular member; the first and second connector members being angularly offset from one another with respect to the longitudinal axis of the tubular members.

('984 patent, col. 3, ln. 68 and col. 4, lns. 1-10) (emphasis added).

The disclosure by the '417 and '984 patents of "connector members" added to the invention's advantages by permit[ting] tissue of an elongated section of a body passageway to be supported by an elongated graft; and provid[ing] the necessary flexibility to negotiate the bends and curves in tortuous body passageways, such as the vascular system.

('984 patent, col. 4, lns. 20-25; '417 patent, col. 5, lns. 39-43)

### III. STANDARD OF REVIEW

Before the court can determine whether any of the asserted claims read on the accused products, the court must construe the claims at issue. Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 52 F.3d 967, 970, 976 (Fed. Cir. 1995) (en banc), aff'd, 517

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:00/ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 9

U.S. 370 (1996). The principles of claim interpretation are well established in the law. The exercise begins always with the claim language, which defines the scope of the claim. See York Prods., Inc. v. Central Tractor Farm & Family Ctr., 99 F.3d 1568, 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1996). In analyzing claim language, the court must employ "normal rules of syntax," Eastman Kodak Co. v. Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., 114 F.3d 1547, 1553 (Fed. Cir. 1997), for "[a] claim must be read in accordance with the precepts of English grammar." In re Hyatt, 708 F.2d 712, 714 (Fed. Cir. 1983). The court must ascribe to any technical term used in a claim "the meaning that it would be given by persons experienced in the field of the invention, unless it is apparent from the patent and the prosecution history that the inventor used the term with a different meaning." Hoechst Celanese Corp. v. BP Chems. Ltd., 78 F.3d 1575, 1578 (Fed. Cir. 1996). Absent an express intent to impart a novel meaning to a claim term, the language of the claim is given its ordinary meaning. York Prods. Inc., 99 F.3d at 1572; Bell Communications Research, Inc. v. Vitalink Communications Corp., 55 F.3d 615, 620 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

In order to give context to the claim language, the court must review as well the specification.

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:53/ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 10

The specification acts as a dictionary when it expressly defines terms used in the claims or when it defines terms by implication . . . . As we have repeatedly stated, "[c]laims must be read in view of the specification, of which they are a part." . . . The specification contains a written description of the invention which must be clear and complete enough to enable those of ordinary skill in the art to make and use it. Thus, the specification is always relevant to the claim construction analysis. Usually, it is dispositive; it is the single best guide to the meaning of a disputed term.

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576, 1582 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (citations omitted). Nonetheless, the claimed invention may not be limited to preferred embodiments or specific examples described in the specification. Texas Instruments, Inc. v. United States Int'l Trade Comm'n, 805 F.2d 1558, 1563 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

The last source of intrinsic evidence relevant to claim interpretation is the prosecution history of the patent, if it has been made part of the record.

This history contains the complete record of all the proceedings before the Patent and Trademark Office, including any express representations made by the applicant regarding the scope of the claims. As such, the record before the Patent and Trademark Office is often of critical significance in determining the meaning of the claims.

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINC #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15.07.15:53/N0.4261609027 P 11

... The claims, specification, and file history . . . constitute the public record of the patentee's claim, a record on which the public is entitled to rely. In other words, competitors are entitled to review the public record, apply the established rules of claim construction, ascertain the scope of the patentee's claimed invention and, thus, design around the claimed invention.

Vitronics Corp., 90 F.3d at 1582-83.

In order to further the "fair notice function of the requirement that the patentee distinctly claim the subject matter disclosed in the patent from which he can exclude others temporarily," Athletic Alternatives, Inc. v. Prince Mfg., Inc., 73 F.3d 1573, 1581 (Fed. Cir. 1996), extrinsic evidence of claim interpretation, such as expert testimony, is not encouraged by the Federal Circuit. See, e.g., Vitronics Corp., 90 F.3d at 1583. The court recognizes, however, that expert testimony may be relevant and helpful to an understanding of the claim language as used by one of ordinary skill in the art.

#### IV. ANALYSIS

As a result of the shared history of the patents-in-suit, the language used in the multiple claims asserted is substantially similar and, the court believes, should be construed consistently. As exemplary claims for purposes of

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINC #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15.11ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 12

claim construction, independent claims 17 and 25 of the '417 patent include most of the disputed claim language. Claim 17, a method claim, reads as follows:

A method for expanding the lumen of a body passageway comprising the steps of: connecting a plurality of intraluminal grafts by at least one flexible connector member disposed between adjacent grafts; inserting the plurality of connected intraluminal grafts, disposed upon a catheter, into the body passageway until the grafts are disposed adjacent a desired location within the body passageway; and expanding a portion of the catheter to provide controllable expansion of the intraluminal grafts radially, outwardly into contact with the body passageway, by deforming a portion of the intraluminal grafts with a force in excess of the elastic limit of the portion of the intraluminal grafts, until the lumen of the body passageway at the desired location in the body passageway has been expanded, whereby the intraluminal grafts prevent the body passageway from collapsing and decreasing the size of the expanded lumen, and the intraluminal [g]rafts remain in the passageway.

('417 patent, col. 14, lns. 39-59) Claim 25 reads:

An expandable intraluminal vascular graft, comprising:  
a plurality of thin-walled tubular members, each having first and second ends and a wall surface disposed between the first and second ends, the wall surface having a substantially uniform thickness and a plurality of slots formed therein, the slots being disposed substantially

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15. 7/15:53/NO.4261609027 P 13

parallel to the longitudinal axis of each tubular member; at least one connector member being disposed between adjacent tubular members to flexibly connect adjacent tubular members; each tubular member having a first diameter which permits intraluminal delivery of the tubular members into a body passageway having a lumen; and the tubular members having a second, expanded and deformed diameter, upon the application from the interior of the tubular members of a radially, outwardly extending force, which second diameter is variable and dependent upon the amount of force applied to the tubular members, whereby the tubular members may be expanded and deformed to expand the lumen of the body passageway.

('417 patent, col. 15, lns. 19-40)<sup>3</sup>

Independent claims 1 and 4 of the '984 patent track the language of claim 25 of the '417 patent except for the following limitation:

---

<sup>3</sup>Claim 29 is substantially identical to claim 25 except that it describes "[a]n expandable prosthesis for a body passageway . . ." ('417 patent, col. 15, lns. 53-68 and col. 16, lns. 1-6) (emphasis added). The word "prosthesis," defined as "an artificial device to replace a missing part of the body," Webster's Third New International Dictionary 1822 (1993) ("Webster's"), is used in the patents-in-suit interchangeably with the word "graft," although the patents distinguish "grafts" as being used to expand "partially occluded segments of a blood vessel, or body passageway," while "prostheses" are used to expand "many other types of body passageways." ('417 patent, col. 6, lns. 22-33)

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINC #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15.1/15:53/NO.4261609027 P 14

[O]nly one connector member being disposed between adjacent tubular members to flexibly connect adjacent tubular members, the connector member being disposed in a substantially parallel relationship with respect to the longitudinal axis of the tubular members and coplanar with each tubular member. . . .

('984 patent, claim 1 at col. 11, lns. 53-59; see also claim 4 at col. 12, lns. 32-38)

**Claim 17 - '417 patent**

The first element in claim 17 that requires interpretation<sup>4</sup> is the phrase "connecting a plurality of intraluminal grafts." To "connect" means "to join, fasten, or link together usu[ally] by means of something intervening . . . ." Webster's at 480. A "plurality" refers to the state of being "plural," which relates to or consists of or contains more than one. Id. at 1745. "Intraluminal" means being within the lumen, or the cavity or passageway of a tubular organ such as a blood vessel. Id. at 1185, 1345. A "graft" is a structure that is "implant [ed] . . . surgically . . . to compensate for a defect"

---

<sup>4</sup>The court preliminarily construed disputed claim language for purposes of resolving motions for injunctive relief. To some extent, therefore, the following analysis may be repetitive of the court's July 17, 1998 memorandum opinion. (D.I. 284)

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINGE. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:00, ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 15

in a body organ or tissue. Webster's II New College Dictionary 483 (1995).<sup>5</sup> Therefore, an "intraluminal graft" is a structure designed for use within a body passageway to compensate for a defect in said passageway. ('417 patent, col. 1, lns. 28-35; col. 6, lns. 23-54; col. 9, lns. 6-13) The court continues to hold that each such "graft" must be functional; i.e., once it has "expanded and deformed," it must be capable of "serv[ing] to prevent a body passageway from collapsing . . . ." ('417 patent, col. 8, lns. 60-63)

The next element in dispute in claim 17 is the phrase "by at least one flexible connector member disposed between adjacent grafts." A "member" is defined as a constituent part of a whole, a component serving to form, compose or make up a unit or whole. Webster's at 1408, 486. A "connector member," therefore, is a discrete structure<sup>6</sup> disposed or particularly arranged between adjacent grafts in order to join them together. "Flexible" means capable of being flexed, turned, bowed, or

---

<sup>5</sup>The court has relied more substantially in this opinion on Webster's Third New International Dictionary for definitions simply because it is the version purchased for and easily available to the court.

'Connecting "by means of something intervening . . . ." Webster's at 480 (emphasis added).

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINCH #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:50/ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 16

twisted without breaking. Id. at 869. The word "flexible" clearly modifies the phrase "connector member." Although it is a purpose of the invention to describe an intraluminal graft "able to flexibly bend, or articulate, with respect to the longitudinal axis of [the] graft" ('417 patent, col. 12, lns. 44-45), there is no requirement in the claim language that each individual graft be flexible, only that the connector member be flexible. This interpretation is consistent with the disputed language of claim 25, which more specifically requires that the connector member be particularly arranged "to flexibly connect" adjacent structures; again, it is the connector member and not the adjacent structures which must provide flexibility.

**Claim 25 - '417 patent**

Claim 25 is a product claim that specifically describes an "expandable intraluminal vascular graft" as comprising at least two "thin-walled tubular members," each tubular member having two ends and a "wall surface" disposed between the two ends. The "wall surface" of each tubular member is further described as having a "substantially uniform thickness" and "a plurality of slots formed therein, the slots being disposed substantially parallel to the longitudinal axis of each tubular member."

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINGL. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:53u/SI. 15:53/N0. 4261609027 P 17

With respect to what comprises a "thin-walled tubular member," a "tubular member" is a discrete structure that has the form of a tube, that is "a hollow elongated usu[ally] cylindrical body . . . ." Webster's at 2459, 2460. An "elongated" form is "notably long in comparison to its width." Id. at 737.<sup>7</sup> Claim 25 of the '417 patent requires that each tubular member have a wall surface with a "plurality of slots formed therein . . . ." The word "wall" is defined as "the external layer of structural material surrounding an object." Id. at 2572. The word "surface" is defined as "the exterior or outside of an object or body . . . ." Id. at 2300. A "slot" is "a long and narrow opening or groove." Id. at 2146; accord '762 patent, col. 7, lns. 17-20.<sup>8</sup> To "form" is "to give a particular shape to." Webster's at 893. "Therein" means "in or into that thing." Id. at 2372.

Cordis maintains that a "tubular member" is a "basic 'building block' of the slotted tube invention," that is, "a tubular member the length of a half-slot with alternating opened

---

<sup>7</sup>Accord C.A. No. 97-550, D.I. 321, Ex. 1; definition of "slot," infra.

<sup>8</sup>"Use of the term 'slot' encompasses an opening whose length is substantially greater than its width, such as an elongated oval opening."

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINGE. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:50/SR:15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 18

and closed slots at each end of the tubular member." (C.A. No. 97-550, D.I. 327, ¶ 20) Cordis relies for its argument on the following language:

Accordingly, slots 82 are preferably uniformly and circumferentially spaced from adjacent slots, and slots 82 adjacent to one another along the longitudinal axis of tubular member 71 are in a staggered relationship with one another.

Alternating slots disposed about the circumference of tubular member 71 at both the first and second ends 72, 73 of tubular member 71 will only have a length equal to approximately one-half of the length of a complete slot 82, such half-slot 82 being bounded by members 78, 79 at both the first and second ends 72, 73 of tubular member 71.

('762 patent, col. 7, lns. 3-13; see also '417 patent, col. 7, lns. 49-68 and col. 8, lns. 1-3; '984 patent, col. 6, lns. 26-36)

As further explained in the specification, the use of alternating "half-slots" at either end of the tubular member permits the graft or prosthesis "to be expanded uniformly, and outwardly, in a controlled manner . . . ." ('417 patent, col. 7, lns. 65-67; '984 patent, col. 6, lns. 42-44)

Cordis' interpretation finds some support in the language of the specification and claim 25 of the '417 patent. Although the specification describes both "complete slot 82" and "half-slot 82," it refers to both generally as "slots." Given

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FING. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 19

that the presence of "half-slots" apparently is essential to the functioning of the graft as contemplated in the patent, the failure of the claim to differentiate between complete and half-slots is a further indication that the term "slots" refers to both complete and half-slots. Therefore, the court concludes that the term "slots" referred to in claim 25 is not limited to "complete" slots.<sup>9</sup>

This conclusion is consistent with the description given in the specification of the length of each "graft, or prosthesis, 70." The specification indicates that each "graft, or prosthesis, 70" has a length of at least "one slot 82."<sup>10</sup> If each "graft, or prosthesis, 70" is comprised of at least two tubular members and each tubular member may be the length of only a "half-slot 82," one could argue that the length of such a graft is "one slot."<sup>11</sup> Consistent with the court's holding that a

---

<sup>9</sup>The court found nothing in the patent or the dictionary definition to limit "slots" to those which are bound on all sides, i.e., "complete" slots. The court notes, however, that in Figures 1A, 1B, 7, and 10, only the "complete slots" are labeled "slots 82"; the half-slots are not similarly labeled.

<sup>10</sup>Compare '417 patent, col. 7, lns. 59-63 with col. 11, lns. 51-55.

<sup>11</sup>It is always difficult for a court to differentiate between what the claim language arguably describes and the preferred embodiment actually describes in the specification.

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINC. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:09/ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 20

graft or prosthesis must be functional, however, a graft or prosthesis comprised of only two "tubular members" must be capable of "retain[ing] its expanded and deformed configuration with the enlarged diameter . . . and resist radial collapse."

('417 patent, col. 7, lns. 6-14; '984 patent, col. 5, lns. 51-54)

In sum, although a "thin-walled tubular member" may be comprised of only "half slots," each tubular member must be elongated (i.e., its length is greater than its width) and, in combination with only an additional tubular member, must be

---

This difficulty is particularly acute in a case such as this, where a preferred embodiment has been described in a series of patents. For instance, building on the invention of the '762 patent (i.e., "utilizing a thin-walled, tubular member as the prosthesis," col. 4, lns. 7-8), the specification of the '417 patent contemplates that the graft or prosthesis disclosed "generally includes a plurality of prostheses, or grafts 70 as defined previously in connection with FIGS 1A, 1B and 2," which figures are taken from the '762 patent. ('417 patent, col. 11, lns. 48-51) In Figures 1A, 1B and 7 of the '417 and '984 patents, the graft or prosthesis "70" and tubular member "71" are identified as the same structure. Likewise, the various written descriptions given of "thin-walled tubular members" are substantially the same as those given of "prostheses." (Compare, e.g., '417 patent, col. 3, lns. 57-63 with col. 5, lns. 4-10) The "connector members" are described as flexibly connecting both "adjacent tubular members" and "adjacent prostheses." (Compare, e.g., '417 patent, col. 3, lns. 63-65; col. 4, lns. 23-25, 59-61; col. 5, lns. 10-13; col. 12, lns. 7-21, 41-51, 59-63) Given the apparent "interchangeability" of the phrases "tubular members," "grafts," and "prostheses," it is with some reluctance that the court distinguishes between these structures for purposes of claim construction.

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINCH #/

(FRI) 1.15'99 15.9/1.15:53/NO.4261609027 P 21

capable of functioning as an expandable intraluminal graft.

Also in dispute is whether the language "wall surface having a substantially uniform thickness and a plurality of slots formed therein" implicates a manufacturing requirement.

Initially, the court agrees that the claim language does not specifically incorporate the manufacturing description given in the specification. ('762 patent, col. 6, lns. 41-44) The court further acknowledges the general principle that "[a] product patent gives the patentee the right to restrict the use and sale of the product regardless of how . . . it was manufactured."

United States v. Studiengesellschaft Kohle, 670 F.2d 1122, 1127 (D.C. Cir. 1981). Because the claim language is somewhat confusing,<sup>12</sup> the court finds it helpful to review the history of the language.

The '665 patent includes in the specification two embodiments of a graft generally described as a "wire mesh tube." Both embodiments are comprised of intersecting elongate members, the elongate members being either "small diameter stainless steel

---

<sup>12</sup>For instance, the claim speaks in terms of the wall's surface having "a substantially uniform thickness." It is commonly understood that surfaces do not have a "thickness"; walls have a thickness. See '417 patent, col. 7, lns. 19-22.

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINC. #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15:59/ST. 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 22

wires having a cylindrical cross-section<sup>13</sup> or "small bars" formed by etching openings in a thin-walled stainless steel tube. ('665 patent, col. 6, lns. 12-44 and col. 7, lns. 3-20) Despite the differences between the two embodiments, presumably they both fall within the scope of the following claim language:

[A] tubular shaped member having first and second ends and a wall surface disposed between the first and second ends, the wall surface being formed by a plurality of intersecting elongate members . . .

('665 patent, claim 13 at col. 10, lns. 48-54; see also claim 18 at col. 11, lns. 21-27; claim 23 at col. 12, lns. 6-10; claim 26 at col. 12, lns. 33-37) (emphasis added). Only the second embodiment found its way into the '762 patent, the specification describing it as such:

Preferably, tubular member 71 is initially a thin-walled stainless steel tube having a uniform wall thickness, and a plurality of slots 82 are formed in the wall surface 74 of tubular member 71.

('417 patent, col. 7, lns. 19-22)

---

<sup>13</sup>The court notes that the intersecting elongate members of this embodiment preferably were "fixedly secured to one another" at the point of intersection by any conventional manner, "such as by welding, soldering, or gluing . . ." ('665 patent, col. 6, lns. 36-52)

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FINE #7

(FRI) 1.15'99 15.3/21.15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 23

For whatever reason, the emphasis from the '665 to the '767, '417, and '984 patents changed from describing what formed the wall surface (intersecting elongate members which implicitly form "openings," '665 patent, col. 7, lns. 15-16) to what was formed in the wall surface (a plurality of slots forming "intersecting elongate members").<sup>14</sup> Nevertheless, the structure (and the method of manufacturing the structure) remained the same. Therefore, although the phrase "a plurality of slots formed therein" modifies the phrase "wall surface" (arguably implying a manufacturing limitation),<sup>15</sup> the court concludes that, whether the presence of material (elongate members) or the absence of material (slots) is emphasized, the structure of the product claimed is adequately described and does not implicate a manufacturing requirement.

#### Claims 1 and 4 - '984 patent

As a final matter, in dispute is the phrase "coplanar with each tubular member," referring to the connector member described in claims 1 and 4 of the '984 patent. "Coplanar" is

---

<sup>14</sup>"Thus, the formation of slots 82 results in at least one elongate member being formed between adjacent slots 82 . . . ." ('417 patent, col. 7, lns. 33-35)

<sup>15</sup>"Cordis' argument that the phrase modifies "thin-walled tubular members" neglects the normal rules of syntax.

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FIN.

(FRI) 1.15'99 15.1.99 15:53/NO. 4261609027 P 24

defined as "lying or acting in the same plane," a "plane" being "a surface such that the straight line that joins any two of its points lies wholly in that surface." Webster's at 502, 1730. In describing "connector members 100," the specification of the '984 patent provides as follows:

Disposed between adjacent tubular members, 71, or adjacent grafts, or prostheses, 70, is a single connector member 100 to flexibly connect adjacent tubular members 71 or grafts, or prostheses, 70. Connector members 100 are preferably formed of the same material as grafts 70, as previously described, and connector members 100 may be formed integrally between adjacent grafts 70, or tubular members 71, as shown in FIG. 7. The cross-sectional configuration of connector members 100, along the longitudinal axis of graft, or prosthesis, 70', is the same, in that connector members 100 have the same uniform wall thickness of elongate members 75 and thus form a thin-walled, elongate bar member 101 which is coplanar with adjacent tubular members 71. Of course, it should be readily apparent to one of ordinary skill in the art, that the thickness of connector members 100 could alternatively be smaller than elongate member 75; however, it is preferable that the outer circumferential surface 102 of connector members 100 lies in the same plane formed by the wall surfaces 74 of grafts, or prostheses, 70, as seen in FIG. 7.

('984 patent, col. 10, lns. 28-48)

The court agrees with Cordis that the word "coplanar" is not a particularly helpful description of a three-dimensional

FROM RICHARDS LAYTON &amp; FIN

(FRI) 1.15'99 16.3/31.15:53/NO.4261609027 P 25

structure." The specification nevertheless describes three embodiments which presumably fall within the scope of the disputed claim language: (1) the connector member is as thick as the tubular member and so is aligned with both its inner and outer walls; (2) the connector member is thinner than the tubular member and lies within (i.e., is aligned with neither) its inner and outer walls; and (3) the connector member is thinner than the tubular member and is aligned with its outer wall. The court agrees with Cordis that the word "coplanar" should be given the broader scope provided for in the specification.

---

"Just as a two-dimensional "surface" does not have a three-dimensional "thickness."